

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by Loyola University Press, 3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
Rev. James A. Kleist, S. J., Editor. Subscription price: One Dollar a Year.

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. IX

FEBRUARY, 1933

No. 5

Vis Consili Expers Mole Ruit Sua

(Horace, *Odes*, III, 4)

I tell you sand will not support the shock!
Dig farther—dig till you strike the living rock!
That's my advice—my last word, I'll not stand
The consequence of building on this sand.

Louis F. Doyle, S. J.

Materialism is, of all the drear dogmas burdening the earth, easily among the most dismal. Its chill, gray cult, deadening as a fog creeping heavily in from the sea, has tinged the world with a sadness that lethargizes the heart wherever it holds sway. And yet—strange perversity—it persists. Though it wear the very mark of doom, men will embrace it; for materialism, like evil of every sort, holds its strange allure. Always there will be those who raise their "topless towers" on its faltering foundations, hoping stubbornly against hope that they will not in the end come crashing down to shiver in a thousand fragments at their feet.

Is there, then, no expedient, no axe to lay to the withering root? Softly, softly; no need for anxiety! There are sure ways of combatting all untruth. There is, for instance, Rome.

All roads, they say, lead to Rome. One might add, "and from it, too." Rome is the world in miniature. Whatever you find anywhere across the face of the earth, you find in Rome—on a scale smaller, perhaps, than in cities of the modern world, but essentially, radically the same. Rome has had at some time or other in the course of her history, all the world's experiences, social, psychological, religious. Bringing coals to Newcastle is as nothing, compared with the folly of bringing experiences to Rome. Rome has had them all. You can teach her no new lessons; for the new to you is dusty with age to her. She is Rome the eternal.

Stat et stabit, manet et manebit,
Caput orbis terrarum.

The Rome of the age called golden, which was the age of Horace, knew of materialism, knew too of its futility. Rome was ever a city, and the Romans ever a people to profit by the experiences of others. From her Liburnian galleys to her achievements in hexameter, Alcaic, and Sapphic verse, Rome was founded on the rock of experience. When she seemed to essay the new and put the old aside, it was not as the daring originator who steps out into the dark and picks his path painstakingly to the top of some shining mount. With full confidence Rome walked serenely in the footprints of predecessors, and her way was ever secure. She added,

no doubt, to the experiences of past days and foreign peoples, but there was always experience to add to. Her genius was for adaptation, for improvement, more than for originating or freshly creating.

Hence, when Rome looked with distrust upon the inroads of harsh materialism into her civilization, it was with a reason. There was the voice of experience sounding in her ear, its fingers plucking warningly at her sleeve. She had seen the lovely flower of Grecian culture fall away to ashes when the informing soul of beauty was forgotten; she had witnessed ancient dynasties crumble and chip like caked earth, when the eyes of kings fluttered and closed to the demands of a law higher than anything the hand of power can lay itself upon; she had felt in the periods of her own internal strife, a shaking and a trembling within her corporate frame that boded ill for the future, when men by sheer force of arms would bend the lives of others to their will. Mere brute force could never, she saw clearly, stand safely at the base of the ambitions she had laid up for herself.

Therefore she whispered her warnings into her poets' ears. "Tell them," she whispered, "tell them of the futility of it all. Tell them that it simply can not be done; that if success is to crown our hopes, materialism and all its base contrivances must be scrapped, and relegated to the refuse-heap. Tell them,—*insta opportune, importune, argue, obsecra*—that the deep spirituality of man's nature must be taken into account. Only on that basis may we hope to build securely."

Among the poets so addressed was Horace. He was only a small voice amidst an uproar so loud as that which materialism could raise; but he was clear, mellow, insistent. When, therefore, he sang out to the nation which was still quaking in its joints from sad conflict with the monster of doom, he was given an attentive hearing.

Vis consili expers mole ruit sua. A few mystic words, enshrined in a halo of verse; almost, you would say, a rope of sand. But they were words fraught with meaning. Men caught their import; saw the deep wisdom, the startling significance beneath their slight exterior. They did not preach, did not force, did not promise violence if their message went unheeded. They merely said: "The powers of matter will rot, will totter and fall to destruction as surely as there is a sky above us, if we exclude the soul of man from our considerations."

They were but a pale statement of the great truth as we of a Christian era know it. Granted. But better a partial truth than none at all. Rome heeded their warn-

ing and began building her towers anew. But she built on a new foundation. She cleared away the sand and hewed down to the sheer rock; and so she built as few nations have done, her efforts remaining until a later day, when—but that is another story.

Milford, Ohio

C. A. BURNS, S. J.

Speaking Latin in the Classroom

Father Zamiara's appeal in the December BULLETIN for the speaking of Latin in college Latin classes opened with a reference to the Middle Ages when Latin was the common means of communicating and circulating thought. He might also have cited for his purpose the succeeding historical epoch, the Renaissance, which indeed decried the Latinity of the Middle Ages as corrupt and barbarous, but withal sustained the tradition of Latin as a spoken language. In fact, it was not until the middle of the Seventeenth Century that a concerted attempt was made to displace Latin in favor of the vernacular in classical teaching. The sponsors of this innovation were the Port Royalists. But the movement thus inaugurated did not attain complete success until the late Eighteenth Century.

Hence the tradition of teaching the classics through the medium of Latin extended over a period of nearly six centuries. And during more than two of those centuries the tradition was kept alive and fostered by the Jesuit system of studies embodied in the *Ratio Studiorum*. Perhaps, then, some consideration of the *Ratio*'s enactments in regard to speaking Latin may support and even strengthen Father Zamiara's timely plea.

The *editio princeps* of the *Ratio* appeared in 1586, the definitive edition in 1599. But the Jesuit schools made the speaking of Latin an integral rule of their system many years before the *Ratio* was published. Indeed, the plan of studies outlined for the first college opened by the Society, at Messina in Sicily in 1548, stated that the aim of Latin study in the grammar classes was to learn to *write and speak* Latin, first with grammatical correctness, then with elegance.¹ Nor did this aim remain a mere ideal. For Father Coudret, one of the young professors in the college, writing in 1551 of the actual classroom practice at Messina, said that all the pupils were required to speak Latin while in the classroom, even in the absence of the Master,—“Nelle scuole tutti gli scuolari, etiam absente il magistro, hanno di parlar latino.”² The same requirement was written in all succeeding plans of study for the Jesuit colleges, and in the *Constitutions* (Part IV, Ch. VI, 13) St. Ignatius laid down the rule: “Omnes quidem, sed praecipue Humaniorum Litterarum studiosi, Latine loquantur.” Though this may have had special reference to students within the Jesuit Order, it applied nevertheless to all students of the humanities in the Society's colleges.

In regard to the *Ratio*, the prescriptions concerning the use of Latin are clear and precise. Since the definitive edition of 1599 reiterates the main points contained in the earlier editions, it will be sufficient to set down what it prescribed, together with the corresponding prescription in the revised *Ratio* of 1832. In both of these

editions the rule is the eighteenth of the Common Rules for Professors of the Lower Classes, and reads in this wise:

Ratio of 1599: Latine loquendi usus severe in primis custoditur, iis scholis exceptis, in quibus discipuli latine nesciunt; ita ut in omnibus quae ad scholam pertinent, nunquam liceat uti patrio sermone, notis etiam adscriptis, si qui neglexerint; eamque ob rem latine perpetuo Magister loquatur.

Ratio of 1832: Curandum in primis ut discipuli latine loquendi consuetudinem acquirant; quare Magister a Suprema saltem Grammatica latine loquatur et ut latine discipuli loquantur exigat, praesertim in praeceptorum explicatione, in corrigendis scriptionibus latinis, in concertationibus, atque etiam in colloquiis. In vertendis vero auctoribus patrii sermonis puritatem et rectam pronuntiationem summopere sibi commendatam existimet, eamque severe a discipulis exigat.

On only one point does the *Ratio* of 1832 differ from that of 1599. Its insistence on purity of diction and correct pronuntiation in translating from Latin into the vernacular implies perhaps a larger use of the mother tongue in translating than formerly was allowed. And certainly in modern times this is deserving of high commendation. In all the other class exercises, however, Latin was to be used: in the explanation of the precepts of grammar, in the correction of Latin compositions, in the class contests, and also when the students conversed with one another. As to the class in which Latin became the vehicle of expression, the practice of the schools (in accord with the *Ratio*) was to make a beginning in the first year of Latin study, increase its use in the second year, and in the third (*Suprema Grammatica*) rigorously enforce it. Thus the vernacular, which was used liberally in the two lower classes, was scarcely tolerated in the third and higher classes.

Various devices were, of course, employed for making the rule of speaking Latin effective. One of these, used extensively in the lower classes and aimed especially at enforcing Latin conversation in the school even outside of class periods, is mentioned in the *Ratios* of 1586, 1591 and 1599. The reference is to *notulae*, *notae*, and *catenulae*, which were probably tickets (possibly pieces of cardboard or a leather medal) decorated with the images of a wolf or an ass. Father Pachtler says that these were in use at Cologne in 1577.³ The ticket was given to the student found speaking the vernacular or bad Latin. He was forced to retain this badge of disgrace until he discovered one of his companions committing the same offense. The student in possession of the ticket at the close of the morning and afternoon session received some sort of punishment. In the continental Jesuit college visited in 1645 by the Puritan divine, John Durie, a ferula passed from hand to hand among the pupils as a penalty for using the vernacular, and it was used to punish the pupil who had it in his possession at the last ringing of the bell.⁴ Father Pachtler also mentions a different sanction placed on the observance of the rule at Cologne. In one of the classes the pupils agreed among themselves to exact pecuniary fines from offenders against the rule.

But whatever the manner of operating the device, its effect was to make the students themselves custodians of

the rule. And their vigilance was exercised without any loss of humor. Rather it was, in the words of John Durie, "but a mere recreation and sport in the school."

As helps to acquiring a facility in Latin speech, the Jesuit schools utilised collections of phrases and particularly short, interesting dialogues treating of classroom routine, games, study, contests and similar topics. Thus the noted volume of dialogues, called *Progymnasmata Latinitatis*, written by Father Pontanus in simple, conversational style, yet with a classic purity of diction, was for long years a text in the lower classes of grammar.

But it seems clear that in addition to such formal aids, the Jesuit masters employed a good deal of direct method in their teaching of Latin,—not indeed by compelling the pupils to learn an unknown tongue through an unknown medium, which is the present-day understanding of the direct method, but rather by showing them from the very beginning how to handle spoken Latin. Hence every precept of grammar was to be illustrated in Latin sentences; and these sentences were to be spoken from memory as well as written down in notebooks. Besides, the Latin grammar was composed in Latin. The result was that though the teacher explained the meaning of the precept in the vernacular (if he was dealing with beginners), nevertheless the repetition of the precept, and its exemplification, was in Latin. For the daily recitation of the rules of grammar and syntax, the system was devised of dividing the class into groups of ten (*decuriae*), each group having a captain (*decurio*). Each of the captains, who were chosen on a basis of scholastic standing and held office for a few weeks or a month, questioned the members of his own group. Question and answer were given in Latin, thus providing further exercise in the competent handling of the language. The teacher's duty during this recitation was to pass from group to group, sometimes demanding the lesson from one or another of the pupils, sometimes questioning the captain himself. In this way, while placing the exercise in the hands of the pupils, he made sure that it was carried out faithfully and well.

Immediately following this recitation, the teacher began the public correction of the written compositions. Again Latin was the vehicle of expression. Then came the explanation of a new set of grammatical rules or of a portion of an author. This was called the *praelectio* and was invariably given by the teacher. When the grade of the class permitted, the explanation was given in Latin, though the *Ratio* allowed the use of the vernacular to make clear a complicated passage or a difficult rule. The final exercise of the morning session was the *exercitatio*, lasting half an hour, during which the teacher conducted a rapid review of the work accomplished during the previous two hours. His object was, by questioning as many as possible, to find out whether the class had been attentive and had understood the matter explained or reviewed. Here too question and answer were worded in Latin.

Added to these daily exercises were the Saturday morning review of the entire week's work, the Saturday

afternoon contest carried on within the classes, occasional inter-class contests, and the literary academy conducted as a part of the Sodality. In all of these exercises Latin was the ordinary means of expression. Thus Latin was, as it were, in the air. The boy wrote, read and spoke Latin constantly, and he had before him the example and correction of the teacher. Emulation quickened the spirit of co-operation. For few boys cared to display ignorance and be relegated to an inferior status in the class.

After this brief exposition of the *Ratio's* enactments in regard to spoken Latin in the classroom, one may ask: Will this help to introduce the speaking of Latin in our Latin classes? I venture to answer affirmatively. Two considerations, however, condition the accomplishment of any substantial and permanent good. Latin speech must be introduced in the early years of Latin study, and all or a majority of Latin teachers must lend support. As things now are, a single teacher, perhaps in fourth high or in some college class, will attempt to get his students to speak Latin. But he finds that the initial process is slow and perhaps takes too much time from required class matter. And even if he does succeed after a fashion with the class, more than likely the beginning thus made will not be developed because the teacher of the next class does not believe in the advisability or utility of making Latin the medium of Latin teaching. Hence little permanent good will be accomplished until a well-planned program is presented to our teachers and united efforts are enlisted to carry it out consistently. The *Ratio* offers the program and suggests methods. Will the teachers accept what is offered and unite to put it into practice?

Milford, Ohio

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

1. This early plan is given in *Monumenta Paedagogica Soc. Iesu*, pp. 614-16 (one of the volumes in the series *Monumenta Historica Soc. Iesu*).
2. *Litterae Quadrimestres* (also in the series *Mon. Hist. Soc. Iesu*), Vol. I, p. 355.
3. G. M. Pachtler: *Ratio Studiorum et Institutiones Scholasticae Soc. Iesu &c.*, Vol. I, p. 145.
4. T. Coreoran, S. J.: *Studies in the History of Classical Teaching*, pp. 229 ff., where Durie's "Description of a Transmarine Schoole" has been edited.

Humanistic education ought, if it is worth anything, to teach men their common inheritance and common standards of valuation at least so far that their differences will not prove wasteful or destructive, and it ought then to leave them to develop their personalities in their several ways.—W. C. Greene

Few minds show a symmetrical growth; advance in one direction is often purchased at great expense in another, and the larger the growth the greater in many cases the deformity.—Gildersleeve

The business of poetry is not to save men's souls, but to make them worth saving.—Flecker

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September by
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS

3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

Subscription price: One Dollar a Year

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post
office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S. J.

St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S. J. St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo.

Joseph A. Walsh, S. J. Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio

Aloysius A. Jacobsmeyer, S. J.

. St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo.

BUSINESS EDITOR

Gilbert C. Peterson, S. J. 3441 North Ashland Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

and St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

All business communications (subscriptions, etc.), should be
sent to the Business Editor, 3441 No. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.,
or St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

OFFICERS OF THE MISSOURI PROVINCE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

President. Joseph A. Walsh, S. J.

Milford, Ohio

Secretary. Alphonse M. Zamara, S. J.

Florissant, Mo.

Vol. IX

FEBRUARY, 1933

No. 5

Editorial

Among the prime essentials of good teaching in high school and college is a constant growth, on the part of the teacher, in knowledge of the subject, of the backgrounds of the subject, and of the chief purpose for which the subject is taught. The first is necessary to keep fresh and to be able to interest and inspire the pupil. In the case of the Classics, this involves especially an ever deepening insight into Latin and Greek as languages; to attain which the teacher needs to read more and more of the classical authors, and in his reading to consult the best dictionaries, commentaries, and grammars. A fuller acquaintance with the backgrounds of his subject implies, besides a wider knowledge of the works of the classical writers themselves, constant study of ancient history, political and literary, of the life and customs of the ancients, their religion, art, etc. A knowledge of the chief purpose for which we teach the Classics means, above all, a realization that in high school and in college it is our first duty to *train* youth in observation, thinking, taste, self-expression, and in an understanding of the fundamental ideas and forms upon which our own civilization rests. Familiarity with these essential factors in the problem of classical teaching is far more important than attention to methods, as it is these factors that must condition all good methods.

That "Ocean Roll"

Half the charm of Virgil's poetry is in his rhythm. And yet, there are high school pupils who read the Aeneid almost like prose—without attention to rhythm

and metre. The pupil who is not trained to taste and relish the majestic roll of the Virgilian hexameter misses—perhaps for life—one of the finer and more significant experiences of a liberal education. Faculties that should have been quickened to life may lie dormant in him forever. He will read

Quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum,

and not thrill to the imagined sight and sound of those galloping troopers; nor will he hear the howling of the strong but fettered winds in

Illi indignantes magno cum murmure montis
circum claustra fremunt.

And what will Virgilian artistry mean to him if he does not hear the steady thud of those Cyclopedian sledges in

Illi inter sese magna vi brachia tollunt.

Or take the passage which prophesies Rome's greatness:

Exequent alii spirantia mollius aera
(credo equidem), vivos ducent de marmore vultus,
orabunt causas melius caelique meatus
describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent;
tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes) pacisque imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

Words, words, words, somewhat like these: "Graeci imagines eum ex aere tum ex marmore fingent, ac facultate dicendi et scientia astrorum nobiles erunt. Romanorum autem erit regnare, bella gerere, gentibus subiectis misericordiam ostendere, urbes nationum superbam funditus delere." Where is the poetry?

Quae cum ita sint, it is sarcasm pure and simple if the teacher reads to his class the well-known lines of Tennyson:

Tho' thine ocean roll of rhythm . . .
Wielder of the stateliest measure
ever moulded by the lips of man!

But we must be candid. It is easy to rhapsodize on the advantages of the rhythmical reading of Virgil, whereas it is difficult to read rhythmically and teach others to do so. Some teachers have found the task of communicating the ability to discern between long and short syllables, not to mention other intricacies of prosody, so wearisome that they abandoned it altogether. But there is in reality no reason for discouragement. Almost all the newer editions of Virgil give a summary of rules that have been found helpful in the classroom. The great interest taken recently in teaching rhythmical reading is abundantly proved by the success of O. J. Kuhnmueneh's "Aids for the Rhythmic Reading of Vergil," of which the fifth edition has just been issued (St. Louis University). By means of four key-words and a few simple rules, this little four-page leaflet, which fits conveniently within the pages of any text edition, summarizes the entire prosody for beginners. Over 20,000 copies are being used throughout the States, from Boston to San Jose, and from Salem, Oregon, to Orlando, Florida.

G. E. G.

The Teaching of Latin in the High School

(A paper read at the second annual meeting of the Missouri Catholic Educational Conference, held at Saint Louis University, Friday, November 25, 1932.)

The Latin language is an old tongue and the teaching of it has become overlaid with the hoary traditions of the centuries. As a result, until rather recent years it was generally assumed that no mutation or amelioration could be conceived of in its pedagogical technique. Latin indeed was taught by the Romans themselves; even the little lads who attended the classes of the *litterator* or *grammaticus* had their difficulties with declensions and endings and spellings, despite the fact that Latin was their native tongue. And all through the Middle Ages devoted teachers were seeking to mould the lips of their young and sometimes half-barbarous charges to the sounds and forms of the ancient Latin speech. The elegant scholars of the Renaissance found in Latin a remarkable tool of multifarious powers; they delighted to use it, even as the ancients had done, for the expression in classic prose and verse of themes of immemorial antiquity. Thus, with all this background, with a continuous teaching tradition of more than two millennia, it was felt that all the tricks of the trade, all the objectives and aims, all the numerous devices of method and technique, must assuredly have been discovered, weighed, and evaluated centuries ago.

Not all of us who have the privilege of being engaged in the teaching of Latin have as yet escaped from the inertia and slackness that such an attitude necessarily carries with it. We have acted in the conduct of our work upon a principle phrased in quite another connection by a master Roman poet: *Eadem sunt omnia semper* [Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, 3.945], "Everything is always the same." We have seen our colleagues in the natural sciences, in history, in sociology, in English, and in the various other subjects of the high school curriculum, forging ahead like pioneers into fresh and untrodden fields—experimenting with new methods, acquiring an acquaintance with new text-books, and restating to themselves objectives and aims. Meanwhile we have been willing too often to remain aloof ourselves and to turn a deaf ear to all suggestion of possible change or improvement.

We have had, it is true, and properly so, a high conception of the value of our stock-in-trade. Latin, we have felt and do feel, is a tried and established educative tool; it has made good its right to be in our secondary curricula as the result of centuries of reliable service; and until its foes can produce something equally good or even better, they have no justification in their efforts to dislodge a subject long deemed so eminently satisfactory. All this complacency, this self-approval, this classic serenity, is of course proper and good. Yet it has for many generations led teachers of the classics into a state of demure quiescence—it has acted as an opiate, inhibiting effort to make still more effective an admittedly effective subject. More than that, it has led to a false confidence that all that was being claimed for Latin was really being achieved.

Twenty years ago an unquestioning, indifferent attitude on the part of a Latin teacher may have been a normal and an accepted thing; ten years ago it may have been easily understood and tolerated; today it is simply impossible. No teacher of Latin can afford to be unaware of the questionings, the suggested newer methods, the experiments, the vigorous assaults and the vigorous defenses, that today are beclouding the hitherto calm and clear skies of secondary Latin.

And so, if there is to be any "message" in these brief remarks of mine, enmeshed in the voluminous folds of the title "The Teaching of Latin in the High School," the message would be this—we Latin teachers must be alert, progressive, awake, informed of all that is new and novel in the field of our chosen subject.

It is almost ten years since the now famous document known as *The Report of the Classical Investigation* began to appear. The discussions this *Report* provoked are still being continued; the waves of approval and opposition are still fluctuating in the ranks of classical teachers. The *Report* itself is but a symbol, a concretization of a very general *why* and *how* and *to what end*.

Now it is abundantly manifest—and this is a point that is, unfortunately, too often disregarded—that no amount of theoretical information as to *how* to teach Latin can supplant an actual knowledge of Latin itself. Admittedly, it is far better to have a teacher who is well versed in Latin and possessed of little or no acquaintance with the theories of teaching, than it is to have an expert in the technique of teaching Latin with a very limited knowledge of the language itself. Yet these are extreme and for the greater part quite hypothetical cases. Somewhere between the ideal, like truth in the proverb, must reside. That is to say, we Latin teachers are properly to look to a knowledge and an ever-increasing knowledge of our subject, but with this knowledge we must not fail to couple a professional interest in the tools and technique of imparting our subject to others.

"But," it is quite properly objected, "these tools and this technique are often illusory and vague and even positively detrimental to the securing of the best results." The objection is only too well founded. And yet, I believe, we cannot afford to be unaware of even the faulty technique and methodology that are being discussed and in some instances actually employed today. On the borderlands of medicine and of every reputable science there are shadowy domains where fraud and quackery flourish, where pretence and delusion hold dominion; a physician must be aware of these obscure contiguous regions in order to expose them, to warn his patients against them. In the same way, the teacher of secondary Latin must have a bowing acquaintance with the fads and fancies, as well as with the more solid methods, that are now being suggested for the teaching of his subject. Of course, it would be impracticable and impossible for any one teacher to embody in his classroom work even all the sound and reputable devices propounded by the numerous methodologists in the field of the ancient languages. But the more widespread his

acquaintance is, the safer and more enlightened will be his eventual choice.

Perhaps a brief and flitting glance at some of the changed attitudes and modes of procedure that have dawned upon the classical horizon during the last ten years or so may now be in order. I shall make mention only of quite familiar movements, and consequently I must presume upon the kindness of my hearers in bespeaking their attention to topics perhaps already well known. But because of their very familiarity, the movements and methods I shall speak of will the better serve to exemplify the thesis I am attempting to prove.

For many years it was assumed in great numbers of American high schools that the second year of Latin should embrace the reading of four books of Caesar; the third year, six orations of Cicero; and the fourth year, six books of Vergil. This was the much discussed, much belauded, and much bemoaned *traditional course*. It had writhed its insidious way into the complete confidence of the American secondary teaching group, and by years of continued practice it had arrogated unto itself an air of the sacrosanct, the venerable, and the immutable. The *traditional course* goes back to the closing decade of the last century, for it springs from the *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* in 1894. Why these particular authors—Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil—to the exclusion of all others, should have been chosen, and why the remarkably extensive readings in them should have been prescribed, were questions never satisfactorily answered in the minds of the mass of the classical teachers of the country. But it was not until the *Report of the Classical Investigation* began to be disseminated and its full inferences to be understood that the long régime of the *traditional course* was at length successfully challenged. The high school Latin text books that have been appearing in the last eight years or so have completely overthrown the old and impossible demands, and college entrance examination boards have modified their requirements in accordance with the newer suggested courses.

Hence today the second year student does not begin his Latin work by making the long-established tripartite partition of Gaul; nor does he venture within a few weeks into long desert-like paragraphs of indirect discourse, where subjunctives and infinitives and accusatives are as multitudinous as grains of sand, and a rare and occasional indicative is like a friendly oasis gleaming under graceful palm-trees. No, if he meets Caesar at all, he will find in many of the newer books, at least for the first semester, that it is a modified and adapted Caesar, sealed in its difficulties to the powers of a student young in the language. And in addition he will encounter, probably, a certain amount of "made" Latin arranged in the form of a continuous story or exposition, some simplified stories from Livy and one or other of the poets, and one or two interesting plays in "made" Latin. The third year book and even the fourth will have something of the same diversification. Furthermore, in neither second, nor third, nor fourth year, will a class be expected to complete the whole book. The

very bulk of the text and its variety of content reflect the questioning attitude and indicate the desire of text book makers to leave a wide and interesting choice of subject-matter to the individual teacher.

A second example of changing attitudes and technique is to be observed in the vigorous advocacy, now being urged, of the so-called *Latin word-order method*. For many years, report after report of classical groups has favored this method in theory; but in practice the old analytical method did maintain, and in many cases is still maintaining, absolute sway in the classroom. No one will deny that the analytical method has much in its favor, and in practice it will perhaps never be completely given up. But may one not inquire whether it is the only possible method? And whether it is best adapted to acquaint the young student with Latin as a language rather than as a puzzle? For to say invariably: "First find the verb—then a subject to go with it—then an object," and so on—to say this is surely not to reproduce in our modern minds the Roman method of grasping the meaning of a sentence.

The men, yes, and the boys, who listened to the thundering eloquence of a Cicero addressing the Roman populace, comprehended his sentences word by word just as they were spoken. They did not keep their minds in intellectual coma, as it were, until they were roused by the clarion call of a verb, with the purpose of then going back and fitting in the remainder of the sentence, as if they were dealing with the complicated parts of a jig-saw puzzle. In listening to spoken discourse they simply could not do so. Now it is the ambition of the *Latin word-order method* to have the student understand his Latin sentence in the order of the Latin words—though not in the first reading in every case or even in the second or the third. But his attitude, at least, is to be shifted. Instead of being told to destroy the vitality, the living organism of the sentence by a cold analytical process, the student is schooled to look upon a Latin sentence as he would upon a sentence in English—to take it as it comes.

Naturally, the most vigorous opposition has been voiced against the *Latin word-order method*. When enunciated for the first time, the method seems to be a vision and a fair frenzy, "such stuff as dreams are made of." We cannot pause to point out the patient labor or explanation and exposition, the detailed suggestions for technique and effective handling, that its proponents have to their credit. The newer text books, even the elementary books, present the method and leave the teacher to use it or not to use it.

Perhaps the most revolutionary measure that our century has thus far seen in the teaching of Latin is that which I should like to glance at as a third example of changing attitudes and transformed methods. I refer to the *direct method* in the teaching of Latin. Admittedly, at least to a great number of classicists, the direct method is still in an experimental stage. Yet no classical teacher can afford to be unaware of these experiments, nor can he be altogether unwilling to give these experiments at the very least a fair hearing.

In brief, the *direct method* seeks to approach Latin through Latin itself. Its advocates base their procedure on two impulses: the impulse to understand, and the impulse towards self-expression. They insist that all languages are tongues, and that much is lost when these languages cease to be spoken. Mr. Andrew, one of the proponents of the *direct method*, remarks in his *Praeceptor*:

Our plain man is right in saying that the aim in learning a language is to "speak" it, because he lays his finger on the characteristic feature of language, namely that it is something spoken. Language is speech; it is a "significant sound" produced musically, that is with a proper rhythm and intonation, by the organs of speech. This is the primary thing in language, all else is secondary. (*op. cit.*, page 8)

The *direct method* favors purely oral teaching at the beginning, with the use of Latin itself (not English) as much as possible from the very first and throughout; a reduction in translation, as the thoughts are to be grasped in Latin or made clear by Latin explanations; the extensive teaching of the life, institutions, history, and the like of the Romans; and the learning of grammar inductively, through spoken Latin and the passages in the reading book.

Now the natural reaction of every teacher of secondary Latin is the simple question: "Can it be done?" Can the methods of teaching the modern languages in some schools, conversation, illustration, and like processes in the language itself, be applied to Latin? The advocates of the *direct method* answer with an unequivocal *yes*. Thus far, the system has been used with apparent success in some English schools, and there are American teachers who assert that they too have used it with great satisfaction in their own classes. Therefore, whether we in theory approve or disapprove such a *direct method*, the simple fact is that it is already among us—possibly to remain. What is to be our own ultimate judgment, our own ultimate procedure?

But let us hurry on. In the fourth place, in these instances of ours, we may cite the sceptical assault—not only by the foes of the classics but by classical teachers themselves—on the actual attainment of those advantages and benefits which we teachers of Latin have traditionally claimed for the study. Numerous indeed have been the ultimate objectives which we laid down for the student of Latin. An increased understanding of Latin elements in English, an increased ability to learn other foreign languages, the development of correct mental habits, the development of an historical and cultural background, the improvement of the pupil's written English: these are but some of the benefits secondary Latin study was supposed to impart. For years the assertion of these advantages had been made, and at length the question was raised as to whether all these objectives were actually being achieved, quite automatically and without special advertence to them on the part of the teacher, among the thousands of students of secondary Latin.

And it was rather generally admitted that they were not thus automatically achieved. Take as just one ex-

ample the "development of an historical and cultural background." That should mean that the student as a result of his study of Latin, let us say in the *traditional course*, had some definite appreciation of the major movements in Roman history, of the rôle played by Rome in Mediterranean and world affairs, of the ordinary activities in the life of the every-day Roman, of the scope and influence of Roman literature, and the like. Now no one will pretend that the high school graduate of some ten years ago possessed such appreciation simply as the result of having pursued the *traditional course* in Latin.

Hence it is that makers of Latin text books today give formal and diligent heed to the attaining of these objectives. English readings, pictures, "made" Latin of a relevant sort, suggested projects, and other pertinent devices are among the means offered to attain, for example, the "development of an historical and cultural background." And in the same fashion the various newer text books, not always of course with the same relative emphasis, have set about planning ways and means to realize the several other objectives which we hold forth.

It is, I believe, an instance, in the fifth place, of the present day questioning attitude on the part of classical teachers that a new emphasis is being placed upon classical organizations and classical magazines. It is neither a pleasant hobby nor a recreation, but an actual duty imposed upon the high school teacher of Latin that he be a reader of some of the professional literature in his field. In no other way can he so readily keep abreast of the times, and so easily learn how others have succeeded and what new and worth-while devices for Latin pedagogy are being made available. While it is not always possible for the Latin teacher to attend the convention sessions of classical organizations, the reading of two or three classical magazines is possible for all. This should be our minimum goal.

A spirit of alertness, then, an attitude of healthy scepticism in regard to the content, the technique, and the aims of our subject, an unwillingness to follow a fixed procedure simply because it has always been followed hitherto, a sense of judicial fairness to new and changing methods, an active desire to be alive to increased knowledge and to the current problems of the classics—these are the ideal qualities of a Latin teacher today.

St. Louis, Mo.

WILLIAM C. KORFMACHER

We often read nowadays of the valor or audacity with which some rebel attacks a hoary tyranny or an antiquated superstition. There is not really any courage at all in attacking hoary and antiquated things, any more than in offering to fight one's grandmother. The really courageous man is he who defies tyrannies young as the morning and superstitions fresh as the first flowers. The only true freethinker is he whose intellect is as much free from the future as from the past. He cares as little for what will be as for what has been; he cares only for what ought to be.—*Chesterton*

They Know Naught of Ships with Purple Cheeks

It is evening. The sun, a huge red ball of flaming fire, while preparing to go down to his bath in the Ocean, sends forth over the rippling waves his rays of pure fire. Afar out on the main, across the wine-dark deep, a tall black ship, bird-like, is gracefully wheeling its bulk along. Full-bellied before the evening breeze, its single white sail, struck by the sun's rays that glance up from the darkening blue sea, has turned a faint roseate hue. As the ship comes floating along closer and closer, the rhythmic splashing of the shapely oars is heard over the water. And now take a quick glance at the bulging sides of the hull. See how they are painted a deep-reddish purple; yes, real purple cheeks they are, glowing with a fiery flush as the parting kisses of Helios touch them.

Such is but one of the lovely vignettes in which Homer's *Odyssey* abounds. You will find it in the eleventh book, where Teiresias instructs Odysseus and tells him what to do after slaying the wooers in his hall:

Then do thou go forth, taking a shapely oar, until thou comest to men that know naught of the sea and eat not of food mingled with salt, and they know naught of ships with purple cheeks, or of shapely oars that are wings unto ships (xi, 124-125).

How delicate, how true to nature, and what a pity had we missed it! We shudder to think how near missing it we actually were. For the seer is not instructing a pupil in the effects of color, tint, or hue. He merely warns an old tar, whose interest in art is negligible, against a people that he is to meet, *a nation that is not sea-faring*. But look, how this prosy thought is dipped in the poet's imagination:

And they know naught of ships with purple cheeks,
Or of shapely oars that are wings unto ships.

All this wealth of poetry we owe to accident, for the seer's instruction could afford to do without it. But Homer cannot help singing, and he cannot sing even of what is mean and commonplace without enriching it by touching it with the wand of his imagination.

Or, again, it is early morning. In the eastern sky, back of the thousand isles of the Aegean, there suddenly appear faint flashes of silvery grey. Dawn, rosy-fingered Dawn, will soon be here. Thin streamers of light, roseate-hued, begin to shoot upward toward the yet starry heaven. You see the pink fingers of the Dawn, ὁδοδείκτυλος Ἠώς, that usher of Helios as he emerges from his bath in the sea. With every precious second the light becomes clearer; the fair roseate brightens into a sunlit saffron. It is the robe of Dawn, nay, saffron-robed Dawn in person, Ἠώς μὲν χρυσοπέπλος. At last, the early-born, the rosy-fingered Dawn is here, in "saffron robe and rosy car," bringing light to God's creation.

It is the things of every-day occurrence that Homer colors for us with the bright hues of fancy or imagination. Yielding to his spell, we hear the thundering of the loud-sounding sea; we feel the gentle fall of snow-flakes on the long and sandy stretch of coast, and

watch the whiteness that covers all things—except the loud-roaring breaker against the beach. From a vantage-ground we spy upon the Trojan camp, and in awe peer into the dark, and see the thousand fires burning in the plain, and in the glow of each of them sit fifty men, and the horses champ white-barley and spelt beside the ears, waiting for the fair-throned Dawn.

Homer's art in the use of the illustrative may well excite wonder. Speaking quite broadly, Vergil's epithets and similes are more firmly rooted in the context, Homer's, more lightly strewn over description and narrative; Vergil's answer the Roman instinct for the useful, Homer's, the human craving for the beautiful; Vergil's are more elaborated by dint of effort, Homer's, lavished more spontaneously—much as the nightingale pours her joyous tidings, full-throated, on the morning wind. But, whether we prefer the palette of Homer or of Vergil, we must learn the art of making their pictures relive in our imagination, if we would read and teach ancient literature successfully. After all, if we love the beauty that Homer and Vergil saw, we not only love and understand Homer's and Vergil's art, but we love and understand the beauty of God's own universe. *Florissant, Mo.* M. J. DONNELLY, S. J.

De Ripio Vinkelo, IV

In horum porro sententias summum imperium exercebat Nicolaus Vedderus, unus e senioribus pagi, idemque dominus cauponae, cuius ad ostium a mane usque ad vesperum ita haerebat, ut se vix tantum moveret, quantum ad solem fugiendum et in altae arboris umbra consistendum opus esset; quam ob rem ex illius corporis motibus vicini horam diei non secus quam e solario cognoscere poterant. Hic profecto quamquam raro ipse audiebat, cum fumum tabaci continenter hauriret, tamen asseclae eius (nam vir vere magnus suos quisque habet asseclas), quid sibi vellet quidve sentiret, probe intellegebant. Nam cum quid ex iis, quae vel legebantur vel dicebantur, ei displicebat, tum concitate fumum hauriens ac brevibus frequentibusque intervallis irate exhalans cernebatur; cum vero delectabatur, lente ac pacate haustum fumum levibus ac sedatis, ut ita dicam, vorticibus emittebat. Interdum etiam, infurnibulo ex ore educto, fragrantem vaporem circum nares intorquens, gravi nutu assensum atque approbationem significabat.

Sed tandem ex hac ipsa arce infelix Ripius ab uxore iurgiosa fusus atque fugatus est; saepe enim in conventum tranquillum subito irrupens, omnes sodales maledictis figebat; neque ipse Nicolaus Vedderus, vir augustissimus, ab effrenata viraginis terribili lingua securus erat, quippe quem, quod otiandi consuetudinem in viro suo foveret, ultro incusaret.

Postremo, misero illo ad desperationem fere adducto ad agri culturae laborem uxorisque clamores vitandos nihil relinquebatur, nisi ut, sumpta ballista, in silvas errabundus abiret. Hic ille interdum sub arbore sedens quicquid in pera habebat cum Lupo partiebatur, in quem tamquam insectationum socium inclinatione voluntatis propendebat. "Hem, mi Lupe" (sic eum alloquebatur) "domina illa quidem tua ut canem te tractat; sed mitte, bone, curas; nam dum ego vivam, amicus, qui pro te stet, non tibi deerit." Tum Lupus, cauda adulans, intente in vultu domini intueri solebat; nec dubium est, quin, si modo canes misericordiae capaces sunt, eosdem ille sensus toto pectore domino suo reddiderit. *Omaha, Neb.* B. DA MILANO, S. J.

What we need chiefly is a deeper knowledge and finer understanding of those few authors who are really the classics.—*Paul Elmer More*

e
r
e
e
e

l
s
t,
-
-
-
s,
e
g
or
-
d
ve
y
ve
e.

co-
ae,
se
ae
us
rio
oa-
ius
ibi
ais,
ate
ate
ate
ous
em
que

osa
um
pse
inis
con-

agri
tur,
ille
upo
ione
tur)
one,
tibi
mini
diae
erit.
J.

ner
the